UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,893	09/19/2000	John Michael Everson	30604	5121

33272   7590   08/29/2005

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
MAILSTOP: KSOPHT0101-22100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER
PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/664,893	EVERSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pramila Parthasarathy	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 June 2005*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 21-36* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 21-36* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

     1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

     2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

     3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the communication filed on June 16, 2005. Claims 1,

4, 7 and 10 have been amended and new Claims 27 – 36 are added. Claims 13 – 20

have been cancelled. Therefore, Claims 1 – 12 and 21 – 36 are pending.

Response to Remarks/Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments/remarks filed 6/16/2005 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.   Claims 1 – 6, 7 – 12 and 21 – 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first

paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s)

contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the

application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The amended independent Claims 1, 7 and new independent Claims 27 and 32, read, " ...plurality of separately secured remote applications ...", "... separately-secured computer applications ...", "... first secured computer application ...", "... second separately-secured computer application....", and Claims 27 and 32 further read "... storing a link ... retrieving the link; ....".

With respect to " ...plurality of separately secured remote applications ...", "... separately-secured computer applications ...", "... first secured computer application ...", "... second separately-secured computer application....", although the specification discloses the authorization servers (16) are coupled with user computers (12) and the application servers (14) via the communications network (22) and are provided for authenticating and authorizing the user computers, the specification does not disclose " ...plurality of separately secured remote applications ...", "... separately-secured computer applications ...", "... first secured computer application ...", "... second separately-secured computer application....". The specification does not indicate how " ...plurality of separately secured remote applications ...", "... separately-secured computer applications ...", "... first secured computer application ...", "... second separately-secured computer application...." are implemented to authenticate and authorize a computer user. Applicant amendment does not clarify " ...plurality of separately secured remote applications ...", "... separately-secured computer applications ...", "... first secured computer application ...", "... second separately-secured computer application...." and merely recites the claims 1 and 7 and summarizes claims 27 – 36.

With respect to "... storing a link ... retrieving the link; ....", the specification does

not indicate how to "... storing a link ... retrieving the link; ...." are configured to

authenticating and authorizing the user to a plurality of separately-secured computer

applications anywhere in the specification. Applicant remarks/arguments do not

address "... storing a link ... retrieving the link; ....", and merely summarizes claims 27 –

36.

The dependent claims 2 – 6, 8 – 12, 21 – 26, 28 – 31 and 33 – 36 are rejected at

least by virtue of their dependency on the dependent claims.

For examination purposes, " ...plurality of separately secured remote applications

...", "... separately-secured computer applications ...", "... first secured computer

application ...", "... second separately-secured computer application....", are broadly

interpreted as applications and "... storing a link ... retrieving the link; ...." broadly

interpreted as storing user identification.

4.   Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the cited prior arts [Alegre et al. U.S.

Patent 6,199,113, Hartman et al. U.S. Patent 5,960,411, Blanco et al U.S. Patent

6,539,482], disclose "a session key that is stored at a client browser and used to access

a trusted network" but argues that prior art does not disclose or suggest "separately-

secured computer applications that are remotely launched by a user", "multiple

application that each requires its own separate authorization" and "using a directory to

store an object accessed by more than one application for purposes of authentication".

Alegre discloses in part, a system providing access to a resource comprises a device for storing a key based on requester authentication; a device for forwarding the key to requester; a device for receiving an original request and the key from the requester, a device for processing the original request and the key from the requester to form a network request; a device for transferring the network request to a trusted network. Alegre further discloses a device for processing the network request to extract the key if the network request was processed by the device for processing the original request and the key; and a device for performing the original request if the key is valid.

Hartman discloses a method and a system for placing an order to purchase an item over the Internet and placing the selection of various items from the electronic catalogs based on the "shopping cart" model (prior art, Background of the invention), wherein the client system displays information that identifies the item and displays an indication of an action that a purchases is to perform to order the identified item. Hartman further discloses that the client system sends to a server system the provided identifier and a request to order the identified item wherein the server system uses the identifier to identify additional information needed to generate an order for the item and then generates the order.

Blanco discloses an authentication procedure, which allows a centralized administration of user data without creating security breaches in networks providing remote access. Blanco further discloses a directory service containing a remote access password using an authentication protocol and directory service protocols, such as

LDAP, wherein LDAP protocol is designed to provide access to directories supporting the X.500 model.

5.   Regarding currently amended independent claims 1, 7 and new independent claims 27 and 32, Applicant argues that Alegre does not teach " …plurality of separately secured remote applications …", "… separately-secured computer applications …", "… first secured computer application …", "… second separately-secured computer application….", and "… storing a link … retrieving the link; ….". These arguments are not found persuasive. Alegre discloses, " …plurality of separately secured remote applications …", "… separately-secured computer applications …", "… first secured computer application …", "… second separately-secured computer application….", (Alegre Column 5 line 8 – Column 6 line 68 and Column 8 lines 16 – 27). Alegre further discloses "… storing a link … retrieving the link; …." (Column 4 line 25 – Column 5 line 20).

6.   Therefore, the examiner respectfully asserts that the cited prior arts do teach or suggest the amended subject matter " …plurality of separately secured remote applications …", "… separately-secured computer applications …", "… first secured computer application …", "… second separately-secured computer application….", and "… storing a link … retrieving the link;", broadly recited in the amended independent claims 1 and 7 and new independent claims 27 and 32. The dependent claims 2 – 6, 8 – 12, 21 – 26, 28 – 31 and 33 – 36 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on

the dependent claims and by other reason set forth in this office action. Accordingly, the

rejection for the pending claims 1 – 12 and 21 – 36 is respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7.   Claims 1 – 4, 7 –10, 21, 24, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,199,113).

8.   Regarding Claim 1, Alegre teaches and describes

storing security information for a plurality of computer users in a user profile

database (Column 4 lines 8 – 36);

the user launching a first secured computer application on an application server

(Column 4 lines 8 – 36);

receiving at an authorization server coupled with the user profile database log-

in information from the computer user who has launched a computer application

(Column 4 lines 8 – 40);

in response to step b, creating a Session ID for the computer user with the

authorization server (Column 4 lines 8 – 40 and Column 6 lines 24 – 42);

storing at least a portion of the Session ID on the user's computer (Column 4

lines 8 – 42);

also in response to step b, creating an object associated with the computer user

or the Session ID (Column 4 lines 8 – 42 and Column 5 lines 8 – 20);

storing the object dynamically in a directory stored in a directory server coupled

with the authorization server and the application server (Column 5 line 48 – Column 6

line 49);

copying at least some of the security information relating to the computer user

from the user profile database to the object in the directory (Column 6 lines 24 – 67);

comparing the log-in information entered by the computer user to the security

information for the computer .user and allowing the computer user access to the first

secured computer application if the user is an authenticated or authorized user of the

first secured computer application (Column 6 lines 24 – 49); and

the user launching a second separately-secured computer application on an

application server (Column 4 lines 48 – 67 and Column 8 lines 22 – 44);

the second separately-secured computer application reading the Session ID on

the user's computer (Column 6 lines 6 – 68); and

the second separately-secured computer applications accessing the object for

the computer user on the directory server in response to the Session ID to authenticate

or authorize the user for the second separately-secured computer applications (Column

5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49).

9.   Regarding Claim 7, Alegre teaches and describes

a user profile database for storing security information for a plurality of computer

users (Column 4 lines 8 – 36);

an authorization server coupled with the user profile database for receiving log-in

information from a computer user who has launched a first secured computer

application, for creating a Session ID for the computer user, for storing at least a portion

of the Session ID on the user's computer and for creating an object associated with the

computer user or the Session ID (Column 4 lines 8 – 42; Column 5 lines 8 – 20 and

Column 6 lines 24 – 42); and

a directory stored in a directory server coupled with the authorization server for

dynamically storing the object created by the authorization server (Column 6 lines 24 –

34),

the authorization server being further operable for copying at least some of the

security information relating to the computer user from the user profile database to the

object in the directory, comparing log-in information entered by the computer user to the

security information for the computer user and allowing the computer user access to the

launched first secured computer application if the user is an authenticated or authorized

user of the computer application (Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49),

the directory server permitting other separately-secured computer applications

launched by the computer user to reference the Session ID read by the separately-

secured computer applications on the user's computer so that the other separately-

secured computer applications may access the object for the computer user on the

directory server to authenticate or authorize the user for the other separately-secured

computer applications (Column 6 lines 6 – 67).

10.   Regarding Claim 27, Alegre teaches and describes

the user remotely launching a first secured computer application from a user

computer (Column 4 lines 8 – 36);

authenticating and authorizing the user to the first secured computer application

by exchanging security information between the user and an authorization server

(Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49);

storing at least a portion of the security information in an object within a dynamic

directory on a directory server (Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49);

storing a link to the object on the user computer (Column 4 lines 25 – 54);

the user remotely launching a second separately-secured computer application

on an application server (Column 4 lines 48 – 67 and Column 8 lines 22 – 44);

retrieving the link (Column 4 lines 25 – 54);

authenticating and authorizing the user to the second separately-secured

computer application by exchanging the stored security information between the

directory server and the application server (Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49).

11.   Regarding Claim 32, Alegre teaches and describes

an authorization server for authenticating and authorizing the user to secured

computer applications by exchanging security information between the user and the

authorization server when a first secured computer application is launched by the user

(Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49);

a directory server storing at least a portion of the security information in an object

within a dynamic directory, wherein a link to the object is stored on the user computer;

and

an application server implementing a second separately-secured computer

application for remote launching by the user, wherein the second separately-secured

computer application retrieves the link, and wherein the user is authenticated and

authorized to the second separately-secured computer application by exchanging the

stored security information between the directory server and the application

server(Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 67).

12.   Claims 2 and 8 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and 7.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes the security information including

authentication and authorization information (Column 4 lines 48 – 67 and Column 7

lines 55 – Column 8 line 20).

13.   Claims 4, 10, 29 and 34 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and

7. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes the Session ID being based on at least

one of the following: a date on which the computer user launched the first secured

computer application; a time in which the computer user launched the first secured

computer application; a TCP/IP address of the computer user; and a user name of the

computer user (Column 3 lines 1 – 11, Column 5 lines 8 – 36 and Column 6 lines 24 –

68).

14.   Claims 3 and 9 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 2 and 8.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes the authentication and authorization

information including at least one of the following: user names, user IDs, passwords,

public-key data, certificates, and access control information (Column 5 line 8 – Column

6 line 65).

15.   Claims 21 and 24 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and 7.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes wherein the other computer applications

access the object on the directory server using a dynamic directory service (Column 5

line 48 – Column 6 line 49).

16.   Claims 30 and 35 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 27 and 32.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes the steps of:

one of the secured computer applications storing application data in the object;

and the other one of the secured computer applications retrieving the application data

according to the link (Column 4 lines 32 – 67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17.   Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 31 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,199,113, hereinafter "Alegre") in

view of Hartman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,960,411 hereinafter "Hartman").

18.   Claims 5, 11, 31 and 36 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1, 7 ,

30 and 35. Alegre does not explicitly disclose that the method for dynamically tracking a

user session includes the steps of creating a shopping cart and storing the shopping

cart along with the object in the directory. However, Hartman discloses a method for

creating a shopping cart and storing the shopping cart along with a unique client

identifier (cookie), purchaser-specific information (Hartman Column 3 line 31 – Column

6 line 21). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hartman's shopping cart system into the dynamically tracking user session system of Alegre.

Alegre could have been modified by Hartman to arrive the claimed invention by having the shopping cart with user purchase information to be saved on the directory as taught by Hartman (See Hartman Column 3 line 31 – Column 8 line 25) and as suggested by Alegre (See Alegre Column 7 line 3 – Column 8 line 53). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Alegre by Hartman as discussed above because in a shopping cart systems user profiles are stored in a directory as taught by Hartman and employing the shopping cart within Alegre would provide an efficient and secure method for dynamically tracking a user session.

19. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 5 and 11. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes the steps of allowing the user to select items to be purchased and storing information relating to the selected items in the shopping cart (Hartman Column 3 line 46 – Column 4 line 26; Column 5 line 27 – Column 6 line 21 and Column 7 line 57 – Column 8 line 25).

20. Claims 22, 23, 25, 26, 28 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,199,113, hereafter "Alegre") in view of Blanco et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,539,482, hereafter "Blanco").

21.   Claims 22, 25, 28 and 33 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 21

and 24. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes wherein the other computer

applications access the object on the directory server using a dynamic directory service

(Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49). Alegre does not explicitly disclose that the

dynamic directory service comprises the lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP).

However, Blanco discloses a network access authentication system that gathers the

data concerning the users, including authentication data, in a data base of a directory,

which uses Light weight directory access protocol which is specifically targeted at

management applications and browsing applications that provide interactive access to

directories (Blanco Column 3 lines 22 – 67).

22.   Motivation to combine Blanco with Alegre comes from the need to provide

authentication and authorization of a user available to an authorization server coupled

with a directory server that stores the authentication (user) data. Alegre provides a

discussion of the need for security and authorization information for all the resources

that a user can access but is silent as to the specific details of the LDAP, see Alegre

Column 1 line 51 – Column 2 line 35 (especially Column 2 lines 24 – 35). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Alegre with Blanco because

LDAP provides the authentication data stored in the directory available to all the

applications that are associated with a directory server and provides interactive access

to directories.

23.   Claims 23 and 26 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 21 and 24.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes wherein the other computer applications

access the object on the directory server using a dynamic directory service (Column 5

line 48 – Column 6 line 49). Alegre does not explicitly disclose that the dynamic

directory service comprises the X.500 access protocol. However, Blanco discloses a

network access authentication system that gathers the data concerning the users,

including authentication data, in a data base of a directory, which uses Light weight

directory access protocol that supports X.500 access protocol (Blanco Column 3 lines

22 – 67).

24.   Motivation to combine Blanco with Alegre comes from the need to provide

authentication and authorization of a user available to an authorization server coupled

with a directory server that stores the authentication (user) data. Alegre provides a

discussion of the need for security and authorization information for all the resources

that a user can access but is silent as to the specific details of the LDAP, see Alegre

Column 1 line 51 – Column 2 line 35 (especially Column 2 lines 24 – 35). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Alegre with Blanco because

LDAP which supports X.500 access protocol, provides the authentication data stored in

the directory available to all the applications that are associated with a directory server

and provides interactive access to directories.

Conclusion

25. Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Applicant is urged to consider the references. However, the references should be evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. If applicants are aware of any better prior art than those are cited, they are required to bring the prior art to the attention of the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m.. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-232-3795. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to

the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose
telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published
applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR only. For more
information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at
866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pramila Parthasarathy
August 19, 2005.

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100